



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS
2 NAVY ANNEX
WASHINGTON DC 20370-5100

BJG
Docket No: 11060-09
20 July 2010



This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to the provisions of title 10 of the United States Code, section 1552.

A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 20 July 2010. Your allegations of error and injustice were reviewed in accordance with administrative regulations and procedures applicable to the proceedings of this Board. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of your application, together with all material submitted in support thereof, your naval record and applicable statutes, regulations and policies.

After careful and conscientious consideration of the entire record, the Board found that the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice. The Board found that you entered active duty in the Navy on 26 July 1974 and were honorably discharged on 1 June 1978. You reenlisted on 2 June 1978. You received nonjudicial punishment on two occasions, and were convicted by a summary and a special court-martial for unauthorized absence (UA) (10 specifications totaling 31 days), disobeying a lawful order, failure to obey a lawful order, and failure to go to your appointed place of duty (five specifications). You then requested an other than honorable (OTH) discharge for the good of the service to avoid trial by court-martial for three

periods of UA totaling 64 days. At that time, you consulted with qualified military counsel and acknowledged the adverse consequences of receiving such a discharge. The separation authority approved your request for an OTH discharge. On 18 April 1980, you were separated with an OTH discharge for the good of the service to avoid trial by court-martial. As a result of this action, you were spared the stigma of a court-martial conviction and the potential penalties of a punitive discharge and confinement at hard labor.

The Board, in its review of your entire record, carefully considered all potential mitigation, such as your prior honorable service. Nevertheless, the Board concluded that these factors were not sufficient to warrant recharacterization of your discharge due to your serious misconduct. Furthermore, the Board believed that considerable clemency was extended to you when your request for discharge to avoid trial by court-martial was approved. It was also clear to the Board that you received the benefit of your bargain with the Navy when your request for discharge was granted and should not be permitted to change it now. In view of the above, your application has been denied. The names and votes of the members of the panel will be furnished upon request.

It is regretted that the circumstances of your case are such that favorable action cannot be taken. You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new and material evidence or other matter not previously considered by the Board. In this regard, it is important to keep in mind that a presumption of regularity attaches to all official records. Consequently, when applying for a correction of an official naval record, the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate the existence of probable material error or injustice.

Sincerely,


W. DEAN PFEIFFER
Executive Director

Copy to:
The Honorable Shelley Berkley